1. Introduction

- In Blackfoot (Plains Algonquian: Southern Alberta), demonstratives are ubiquitous
  - Wide variety of functions
  - One of only three word classes in this highly polysynthetic language
  - 900 unique and morphosyntactically complex forms
- In oral stories, the distribution of demonstratives is particularly broad; many appear with:
  - no clear referent or nominal complement
  - no semantic contribution to the propositional content of the utterance
- **“Untranslatable” demonstratives**
- **Objective**: Explore the properties of “untranslatable” demonstratives
  - Catalogue morphological and syntactic properties
  - Track discourse conditions
  - Seek correlations as a means to identify discourse functions
- **Proposal**: “Untranslatable” demonstratives function as discourse particles
  - Demonstratives are multi-functional
  - Discourse particle function is derived in a particular context
  - Meaning component(s) of the demonstratives restrict their distribution and interpretation as discourse particles
    - Deictic distinctions (near speaker/addressee/other) “translate” to speaker/addressee/other epistemic orientations
- **Outline of the talk**:
  - §2 Sources of Data and Methodology
  - §3 Background on Blackfoot Demonstratives & Particles
  - §4 Framework: Diagnosing Discourse Particles
  - §5 Blackfoot “Untranslatable” Demonstratives as Discourse Particles
  - §6 Summary and Conclusions

---

* HB: I am honoured and grateful to be working together with a number of Siksika Blackfoot speakers, who are generous in sharing their knowledge, stories, and words, including: Donna Axe, Shawn Axe, Edith Breaker, Fred Breaker, Noreen Breaker, Clifford Crane Bear, Hanks Eagle Head, Rachel Ermineskin, Elsie Maguire, Roslyn Many Guns, Allan Stevens, Walter Stevens, Mildred Three Suns, and Evelyn Weasel Head. Nitsiko’ tahsi’ taki. HB & MW: We are grateful to the late Tootsinam Beatrice Bullshields for many years of patience in teaching us (about) the Kainai Blackfoot language. Nitsiko’ tahsi’ takihpinnaan ki kitaakimattsinohpinnaan. This research is supported by a Banting Fellowship, a SSHRC Insight Grant, the Jacobs Fund, and the Phillips Fund.
2. **Sources of Data and Methodology**

- Data sources include fieldwork and stories
  - **Syntactic fieldwork (2003-present)**
    - Context-dependent elicitation, storyboards, etc.
    - Positive and negative data
  - **Oral stories: Three sources**
      - Collection of eight stories
      - Blackfoot, French, English – audio and transcript
      - I have added morphological analysis added for 4 stories
      - (Auditory survey of other 4)
      - No information about storyteller or storytelling situation
    - Russell & Genee 2014: Ákaitsinikssiistsi Blackfoot Stories of Old
      - Collection of eight stories
      - Transcript with English translation
      - No morphological analysis, no audio recording
    - Blackfoot Stories Database: [http://stories.blackfoot.atlas-ling.ca/#/stories](http://stories.blackfoot.atlas-ling.ca/#/stories)
      - Collection of 61 stories (currently 20 are public on the site)
      - Most recorded by me; some recorded by other researchers\(^1\)
      - Various stages of transcription/analysis
  - **Methodology**:
    - 26 stories fully surveyed with “untranslatable” demonstratives catalogued
    - Visual survey of transcribed stories
    - Auditory survey of un-transcribed stories (with translation help from Noreen Breaker)
    - Demonstratives catalogued according to morphosyntactic and discourse properties
  - **Limitations**:
    - No conversation data (some recorded, but not analysed)
    - Stories from other sources (may) lack crucial information:
      - Storytelling context (Audience? Other interlocutors?)
      - Intonation
      - Possible omissions from transcript ("untranslatables” not transcribed?)

---

\(^1\) Thanks to Joel Dunham, Inge Genee, Meagan Louie, Natalie Weber, Ryan Waldie for sharing these stories.
3. Background: Blackfoot Demonstratives and Particles

3.1. Blackfoot Demonstratives

- Demonstratives are one of only three word classes in Blackfoot (Bliss 2013)

(1) *Nitsikkia'yohkottitsapopi ami oto'óhtainniso'tsi'kao'pi.*

nit-ikkia'-ohkott-it-sapopii am-yi ot-o'htainniso'tsi'kao'p-yi
1-finally-able-LOC-ride.AI DEM-INAN 3-sled-INAN

“I was finally able to ride in her sleigh.” (Beatrice Bullshields: Itáísapssiisskiitso’pa)

3.1.1. Composition of Demonstratives

- Morphologically complex
- 900 possible forms; no combinatoric restrictions

(2) Demonstrative template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>diminutive</th>
<th>restrictor</th>
<th>inflection</th>
<th>reinforcer</th>
<th>verbalizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>am</em></td>
<td>-sst</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-wa</td>
<td>-ma</td>
<td>-o’k(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ann</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-yi</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>-dyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-iksi</td>
<td>-hka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-istsi</td>
<td>-ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stem Suffixes

- Choice of form conditioned by syntactic, semantic, pragmatic factors (Schupbach 2013)

3.1.2. Demonstratives as Determiners

- Demonstratives are the only determiner-like elements in Blackfoot
- As determiners, they have a classic D-like distribution
- Required with arguments:

---

2 Uncited data are from the first author’s fieldwork with Siksika and Kainai speakers (2003-present). Examples from stories are listed with the story’s author and title; stories from the Glenbow collection are listed as “Glenbow” in lieu of author information. Data are represented in orthography developed by Frantz (1978, 2017); acute accent diacritics are used to mark pitch accent. Abbreviations: 1,2,3=1st, 2nd, 3rd person; ACCOMP(animent); AI=animate intransitive; CONJ(unct); DEM(onstrative root); DIR(ect); EVID(ential); FUT(ure); IC=initial change; INAN(imate); INTERR(ogative); INVIS(ible); LOC(ative); MNR=manner; MVNG=moving; NEG(ative); NOM(inal); ONAFF(irmative); OBV(iative); OTH.TM=other time; PART(icle); PL(ural); PRN=pronoun; PROX(imate); RESTR(ictor); SG=singular; STAT(ionary); TA=transitive animate; TI=transitive inanimate; VBZR=verbalizer.
3.1.3. Demonstratives as Pronouns

- As pronouns, demonstratives may be interpreted as human or non-human, definite or indefinite:

(5) Nimáátowaanhpa ann.
nit-maat-waanii-hpa ann
1-NEG-say.AI-NONAFF DEM
“I am not saying that.”

(6) Annooma ita’páiiswiwa.
ann-o-ma it-a’p-a-issi-wa
DEM-RESTR-STAT LOC-around-IMPF-be.AI-PROX
“She’s around here.”

(7) Ísstsiiwoka ámohka awaasáii’nivahka.
yísstsi-k-wa am-o-hka a-waasáii’ni-wa-hka
listen-IMP.PL-PROX DEM-RESTR-INVIS IMPF-cry.AI-PROX-REP
“Listen to someone crying.”

3.1.4. Demonstratives as Predicates

- Demonstratives can function as predicates, (usually) with a ‘verbalizing’ suffix

(8) Óómahko’ka.
oom-wa-hk-o’ka
DEM-PROX-INVIS-VBZR
“It’s way over there.”

(9) Annihkayi ama mákoyisskiim itsipo’toyii ami issitsimaan.
an-nyi-hk-ayi am-wa makoyi-sskiim it-ipo’to-yyi-wa am-yi issitsimaan-yi
DEM-OBV-INVIS-VBZR DEM-PROX wolf-? LOC-release.TA-DIR-PROX DEM-OBV baby-OBV
“And that was why” the wolf let the baby go.”

(Beatrice Bullshields: Left Behind)
3.1.5. Temporal Demonstratives

- Demonstratives are often used with temporal reference
- Various syntactic functions: determiner, pronoun, predicate
- Often but not always sentence-initial
- Often but not always with post-inflectional –ka “other time”

3.1.6. “Untranslatable” Demonstratives

- Beyond their determiner, pronominal, and predicative uses, demonstratives have a broader distribution in oral stories, without a clear referent or nominal complement, often not translatable
3.2. Blackfoot Particles

- Blackfoot discourse particles of the type that are very common in e.g., German are very rare in speech (monological and dialogical)
  - Uninflected particles are rare
  - Certain verbal prefixes are common in narratives and take on discourse functions (e.g., locative it-, Bliss 2014)
  - Code-switching: Canadian English eh is common in dialogue

- The Blackfoot Dictionary (Frantz & Russell 1995) lists only 31 entries classified as UND “underived particles” (excluding vocatives)

- Some are indeed underived particles, although not necessarily discourse particles

  (17) a. saa ‘no’
  b. áa ‘yes’
  c. oki ‘hello’
  d. ki ‘and’ (conjunction)
  e. tsimá ‘where?’
  f. tsa ‘how?’ (often used in question formation)
  g. yáóo ~ yáa ‘oh no!’
  h. ha’ ‘pfft! ha!’ (used to express scorn)

- Some are concatenations of particles

  (18) ha’yaa
       ha’-yaa
       scorn-oh.no
       ‘uh-oh!’ (in anticipation of reprimand)

- The majority of UND entries in the dictionary involve demonstrative morphology in one of three ways:

  ➔ (i) Inflected demonstratives listed as UND

  (19) annóhk
       ann-o-hk
       DEM-RESTR-INVIS
       ‘right now’

  (20) ánniayi
       ann-yi-ayi
       DEM-INAN-VBZR
       ‘that’s enough’

---

3 There is a newer edition of the Dictionary (Frantz & Russell 2017), but we have yet not conducted a search of UND items in this edition.
(ii) Particle + demonstrative concatenations

(21) *kiann*

| ki-ann | (compare: *ki* ‘and’) |
| CONJ-DEM | ‘that’s all’ (often used to conclude a story) |

(22) *há’annia*

| ha’-ann-yi-ya | (compare: *ha* ‘pfft’) |
| PART-DEM-INAN-MVNG | ‘really, all right’ |

(iii) Particle with demonstrative suffixes (no demonstrative root)

(23) *sááhkáyi*

| saa-hk-ayi | (compare: *saa* ‘no’) |
| PART-INVIS-VBZR | ‘just kidding’ |

(24) *kíka*

| ki-ka | (compare: *ki* ‘and’) |
| PART-OTH.TM | ‘wait’ |

3.3. Summary

- Demonstratives are complex, and can encode a wide range of information
- Demonstratives are multi-functional; they are used in various different ways
- Demonstratives and particles form a natural class

Demonstratives can scope over:
- individuals (determiners or pronouns)
- situations (predicates)
- times (temporal)

**Proposal:**

- Demonstratives can also scope over propositions
- Demonstratives can function as discourse particles

4. Framework: Diagnosing Discourse Particles

- Discourse particles help interlocutors manage the common ground in a conversation by conveying the interlocutors’ commitments, attitudes, beliefs regarding the propositional content of an utterance
- e.g., Miebsch Bavarian *fei, ja, eh* (examples from Thoma 2017)
a. Da Marinus is *fei* drei.
b. Da Marinus is *ja* drei.
c. Da Marinus is *eh* drei.

⇒ Same meaning, but different ‘flavour’ and different contexts of use

4.1. Characteristics of Discourse Particles

- Schourup (1999) identifies the following characteristics of discourse markers⁴
  - *Connectivity*: relate the utterance to other discourse units
  - *Optionality*: omission does not result in ungrammaticality⁵
  - *Non-truth conditionality*: do not contribute propositional content
  - *Weak clause association*: not integrated into the syntax of the clause⁶
  - *Initiality*: often (but not always) occur sentence-initially
  - *Orality*: occur in speech contexts (not usually in writing)⁷
  - *Multi-categoriality*: lexical items associate with other syntactic categories

4.2. Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Particles

4.2.1. Epistemic Orientation

- The primary contribution of a discourse particle is **epistemicity**

- Discourse particles can be categorized according to which discourse participant’s epistemic stance is under discussion (Thoma 2017; see also Beyssade & Marandin 2006; Lam 2014; Zimmermann 2011)
  - S-oriented: relates utterance content to Speaker’s beliefs
  - A-oriented: relates utterance content to Addressee’s beliefs
  - O-oriented: relates utterance content to beliefs of contextually determined other

- S-orientation vs. A-orientation (examples from Wiltschko 2016, based on Thoma 2017)

(26) **CONTEXT:** Speaker meets friend on street whom she hasn’t seen for a long while.

*Du host leicht an neichn Hund.*

“You have a new dog” [I didn’t know that]

---

⁴ See Thoma (2017) and references therein for distinguishing between “discourse particles” and “discourse markers.” For simplicity, we assume that Schourup’s list of characteristics can equally apply to both.

⁵ Schourup’s definition of optionality does not consider the fact that, although not ungrammatical, omitting a discourse particle in a particular context may be perceived as infelicitous.

⁶ See Thoma (2017) for discussion and analysis of German discourse particles, which have proposition-level scope, but are syntactically integrated into the clause.

⁷ The relevant point here, in our opinion, is that discourse particles occur in discourse contexts with a Speaker and Addressee. Written forms such as texting (etc.) that are dialogical in this way permit discourse particles.
(27) CONTEXT: Speaker responds to query about her vacation plans (i.e., why she isn’t travelling)

*I hob fei oan Hund.*

“I have a new dog” [You don’t see to know this]

- While epistemic orientation is the primary function of discourse particles, they can express other pragmatic functions as well, including noteworthiness, emotivity, and emphasis

4.2.2. Noteworthiness

- Particles can function to draw interlocutors’ attention to a proposition as being particularly *noteworthy* in the context of the discourse

  - e.g., Jónsson (2017): Icelandic particles *en*, *vá*, and *æ* are required by some speakers with certain exclamatives to give them their noteworthy ‘flavour’

  - e.g., Haselow (2012): English *even* can signal “enrichment of the information value” of a proposition, expressing a “subjective comment like surprise, enthusiasm, or unexpectedness”

4.2.3. Emotivity

- Particles can function to signal interlocutors’ emotive attitude or personal reaction (positive or negative) towards the content of a proposition

  - e.g., Response particles (e.g., *yes*, *no*), see Wiltschko 2017
  - e.g., Emotive markers (e.g., *alas*), see Rett 2017

  - Emotivity is often *modificational*, achieved via *prosodic* features such as lengthening, pitch accent, etc. (see Benus et al. 2007 on *whatever*)

4.2.4. Emphasis

- Particles can strengthen or emphasize the content (and/or the interlocutors’ commitment to or certainty about the content) of a proposition (e.g., Thoma 2017)

  - e.g., sentence-final *anyway* as an “emphasizer of a specific state of affairs expressed in a proposition” (Haselow 2012: 195)

  - Like emotivity, emphasis may be indicated prosodically (e.g., *yesssss* in response to good news, see Wiltschko 2016)

5. Blackfoot “Untranslatable” Demonstratives as Discourse Particles

- *Proposal:* Blackfoot demonstratives are multi-functional, and can function as discourse particles

  - They exhibit characteristics typical of discourse particles
  - They encode pragmatic functions of discourse particles
5.1. Blackfoot Demonstratives Exhibit Characteristics of Discourse Particles

**Connectivity**
- Connect propositions to interlocutors’ epistemic stance (see section 5.2)
- Also frequently used with the conjunction *ki*
  - Schourup 1999: discourse particles “contribute to inter-utterance coherence”

(28) **Kiwa** ann **otanistssi**, maataokitsiihtaawaatsiks.
**ki-wa** ann ot-waanisttsi-hs-yi maat-a-okitsihta-waatsiksik

CONJ-PROX DEM 3-do.smthng.AI-CONJ-OBV NEG-IMPF-have.bad.intentions.AI-NONAFF
“And yet when he acted, it was not with bad intentions.” (Glenbow: Naapi)

(29) **Kimii** tsaaommitsskiá’pomaahkááhpinnnaan.
**ki-am-yi** nit-saommit-sskí-a’p-omaahkáa-hpinnnaan

CONJ-DEM-OBV 1-furtively-back-around-travel.AI-1PL
“We snuck back.” (Clifford Crane Bear: Iisttsáápikimmiksi)

**Non-Truth Conditionality & Optionality**
- Evidenced by the fact that they are “untranslatable”
- Omission results in grammatical utterance with same truth conditions

**Weak Clause Association / Initiality**
- “Untranslatables” consistently appear at the left edge of the clause, unless preceded by *ki* (e.g., (26), (27)) or by a subject/topic DP

(30) **Omi** siksinnaki **omi omi** máátaanistsi’tooyi miksi matapiáksi.
**om-yi** siksinnaki-wa **om-yi om-yi** maat-waanistsí’to-yii-wa om-iksi matapi-iksi

DEM-PROX policeman-PROX DEM-OBV DEM-OBV NEG-obey.TA-DIR-PROX DEM-PL person-PL
“The policeman didn’t listen to the people.” (Allan Stevens: O’kaan)

- Temporal demonstratives show this same ordering restriction (see section 3.1.5)

**Orality**
- Our corpus of “untranslatable” demonstratives consists entirely of oral stories

- Is storytelling discourse? Depends on the storytelling setting and how the storyteller perceives his/her audience

- “Untranslatable” demonstratives are found far more frequently in the Blackfoot Stories Database than in the Glenbow collection, and none are found in the Russell collection
  - Majority of the first collection are recorded in group settings (many storytellers gathered to share stories and converse with each other)
  - (Storytelling context of the other two collections is unknown)

**Multi-categoriality**
- Demonstratives also function as determiners, pronouns, predicates
(See, e.g., Thoma 2017; Wiltschko 2016 on the multi-functionality of discourse particles)

5.2. Blackfoot Demonstratives Function as Discourse Particles

- A survey of Blackfoot’s “untranslatable” demonstratives reveals correlations between the pragmatic functions associated with discourse particles and the various “components” of demonstratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic Function</th>
<th>Demonstrative Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic Orientation</td>
<td>Root Distinctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noteworthiness</td>
<td>Inflectional Contrasts (Proximate/Obviative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotivity</td>
<td>Vowel Lengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Reduplication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1. Demonstrative Roots Encode Epistemic Orientation

- Demonstrative roots are categorized according to a person-based proximity system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>Proximity/familiarity to speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ann</td>
<td>Proximity/familiarity to addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om</td>
<td>Proximity/familiarity to neither speaker nor addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All three roots are attested as “untranslatable” demonstratives.

- The am- and ann- forms partition as predicted with respect to epistemic orientation:
  - (a)m- = content of proposition (p) is expected, familiar, often repeated
    = S-oriented (S believes p)
  - (a)nn- = content of proposition (p) is unexpected, new, transitional, contrary
    = A-oriented (S believes A does not already know p)

(31) CONTEXT: Grandfather is trying to find someone who can transport his labouring wife to the hospital. After a few unsuccessful attempts, he returns home to check on his wife, and then:

---

8 The initial vowel of untranslatable and other demonstratives is frequently dropped, obscuring the distinction between am- and om- forms. In our corpus of untranslatable demonstratives, there are only three om- forms (with the initial vowel) and no am- ones. We assume all of the m- forms are underlyingly am- based on their distribution.
(32) CONTEXT (Describing a dream): The speaker hears music and is wandering around and around, trying to locate its source. Finally:

*Kiann* nitáito’too itohkanáópiiyaa itáákopyaa áíkaahtsiyaa.

ki-ann nit-a-it’too it-ohkana-opií-yaawa it-yaak-opií-yaawa a-ikaahtsi-yaawa

CONJ-DEM 1-IMPF-LOC-arrive.AI LOC-all-sit-3PL LOC-FUT-sit-3PL IMPF-gamble-3PL

“I arrived there, and these people were all sitting; they would just sit there, gambling.”

(Mildred Three Suns: Aipapaainihkssin)

- The *om-* forms do not obviously form a natural class wrt epistemic orientation
  - … but only three examples
  - … Thoma (2017) argues that O-orientation is “chameleon”-like, shifting according to perspectival factors, with O sometimes coinciding with S or A in alternate times, places, or situations
  - This is consistent with one example of *om-* which is used in the context of the speaker describing a vision he experienced (i.e., out-of-body / O-not-S situation):

(33) *Omi* omi máätana’sitoyiwa omiksi matapíksi.

om-yi om-yi mááit-waana’sitoyiwa om-iksi matapí-iksi.

DEM-OBV DEM-OBV NEG-light.up.AI-PROX DEM-PL person-PL

“The people weren’t illuminated.”

(Allan Stevens: Itáípisssa’piio’pa)

### 5.2.2. Demonstrative Inflection Encodes Noteworthiness

- Demonstratives take the same inflection as nouns

Table 3. Nominal Inflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Animate</strong></th>
<th><strong>Inanimate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Proximate</td>
<td>-wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obviative</td>
<td>-yí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>-iksi</td>
<td>-ítsi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Only singular inflection is attested with “untranslatable” demonstratives
- Both -wa and -yí are attested, but -yí forms are far more frequent
- –wa forms are used with salient or key information in the context of the plotline of the story
propositions that the audience should regard as important or noteworthy in the development of the story
not necessarily the climax, but points of note that impact the climax, resolution, or moral of the story

(34) CONTEXT: A child is trying to protect some unhatched duck eggs, but the family dog repeatedly finds the nest and eats the eggs. This is the third and final time the dog does this, before the child makes a drastic move to protect the one remaining egg:

Kimaa ki ama nitómitaaminnaan
ki-am-wa ki am-wa nit-omitaa-m-innaan
CONJ-DEM-PROX CONJ DEM-PROX 1-dog-POSS-1PL
mattsistáó’hkoonima omi oyíyiskaassini.
mattsista’-ohkooni-m-wa om-yi oyíyis-kaa-ssin-yi
again-find.TI-3:INAN-PROX DEM-INAN nest-?-NOM-INAN

“And then our dog found the nest again.” (Beatrice Bullshields: Sa’aiwa)

Familiar/expected information (S-oriented), but salient moment in the plotline of the story

• Compare with –yi forms, which are used elsewhere (without the same sense of noteworthiness)

(35) CONTEXT: Grandfather is being questioned by the police (this is the main focus of the story), and as an aside, the storyteller notes that he had to wait for a long time for his grandfather to return:

Kiannika isáma piwa.
ki-ann-yi-ka isam-a’pii-wa
CONJ-DEM-OBV-OTH.TM long.time-be.II-PROX

“It was a long time.” (Clifford Crane Bear: Isttstsáápikimmaksi)

• The contrast observed here between –wa and –yi forms parallels the proximate/obviative contrast observed on nouns (Bliss 2017, and references therein)

o Proximate –wa has a foregrounding function, signalling which character is most salient
o Obviative –yi is used as a ‘default’ for all subsidiary characters

5.2.3. Demonstrative Vowel Lengthening Encodes Emotivity

• Vowel lengthening is common with demonstratives
• When demonstratives function as deictic pronouns or demonstratives, vowel lengthening is iconic

The longer the vowel, the further away the referent is from the speaker

a. Na Carmelle ínöyiwa omi ksíiskstakíi.
ann-wa C ii-in-o-yi-wa om-yi ksíiskstaki-yi
DEM-PROX C IC-see-TA-DIR-PROX DEM-OBV beaver-OBV

Bliss & Wilschko, Blackfoot Demonstratives
Workshop on the Discourse Functions of Demonstratives
Universitetet i Oslo, June 14-15 2018
p. 13
“Carmelle saw that beaver.”

b. Na Carmelle íínoyiiwa oomi ksískstakii.
   “Carmelle saw that beaver (way over there).”

c. Na Carmelle íínoyiiwa oomi ksískstakii.
   “Carmelle saw that beaver (waaayyy over there).”

- When demonstratives function as discourse particles, vowel lengthening can be used in contexts in which the speaker has an emotional connection (positive or negative) to the content of the utterance.

(37) CONTEXT: A child wants to go sledding with her sisters, but they won’t share their sleds. She finds a wash basin and gleefully slides down the snowy hill in it.

Kimiĩi nitóhtsitsinnohpíi nitsinnoo’tokhpi.  
ki-am-yi nit-oht-it-inn-ohpi’yí nít-inn-o’tok-ohpi’yí  
CONJ-DEM-OBV 1-MEANS-LOC-down-fall.AI 1-down-in.circle-fall.AI  
“And with it, I went down, spinning in circles.” (Beatrice Bullshields: Itáísapssiisskiito’spa)

(38) CONTEXT: A child wants to accompany her grandparents to a Medicine Pipe Dance, but they tell her she is too young and leave without her.

Kimiĩi niísto nísstónnatsatomasaapaasai’ni.  
ki-am-yí níísto nít-stotmat-sotam-sap-waasai’ni.  
CONJ-DEM-OBV 1-PRN 1-extremely-genuinely-?-cry.AI  
“I kept crying and crying after them.” (Beatrice Bullshields: Itohkanao’tsisíyo’p)

- Vowel lengthening is also used in other contexts, seemingly to build suspense.
  - Evoking emotional response from addressee (?)

(39) CONTEXT: A young man is helping his grandfather with a task that the police later take notice of; he is confused about why they are doing what they are doing.

Kimiíii nitátítopokská’ssépiinaan.  
ki-am-yí nit-a-itap-okska’sí-hpiinaan  
CONJ-DEM-OBV IMPF-toward-run-1PL  
“And we ran towards (something).” (Clifford Crane Bear: Iísttstsáápikimmiksi)

- Vowel is extra-long (= 0.877 s)
- Compare with the vowel of ki (= 0.073 s)

5.2.4. Demonstrative Reduplication Encodes Emphasis

- Demonstrative reduplication is frequently used by one storyteller in particular, and less frequently with one other storyteller.

- A clear correlation between reduplication and discourse context is difficult to ascertain, but we hypothesize that reduplication is used for emphatic purposes.
(40) CONTEXT: At a Sundance ceremony, a police officer violated protocol by crossing in front of the dancers, and later that day fatalistically broke his leg.

Siksinnaki omi omi máátaanistsi'tooyi miki matapíksi.
siksinnaki-wa om-yi om-yi maat-waanistsi’to-yi-wa om-iksi matapi-iksi
policeman-PROX DEM-OBV DEM-OBV NEG-obey.TA-DIR-PROX DEM-PL person-PL

“The policeman didn’t listen to the people.”

(Allan Stevens: O’kaan)

6. Summary and Conclusions

- Blackfoot demonstratives are multi-functional, and can scope over individuals, situations, times, and propositions
- Proposition-level demonstratives function as discourse particles
- Their various meaning components allow them to take on pragmatic functions associated with discourse particles

Table 1. Mapping Pragmatic Functions to Demonstrative Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic Function</th>
<th>Demonstrative Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic Orientation</td>
<td>Root Distinctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noteworthiness</td>
<td>Inflectional Contrasts (Proximate/Obviative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotivity</td>
<td>Vowel Lengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Reduplication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The particle/demonstrative connection is not unique to Blackfoot
  - Dene demonstratives grammaticalized as discourse particles (Thompson et al. 2011)
  - German particles derived from proto-Indo-European demonstratives (e.g., Thoma 2017)
  - Hebrew and German demonstratives can evoke emotive reactions (negative appraisal), similarly to particles (e.g., Sichel & Wiltschko 2018)

- Future research:
  - Expand corpus
  - Extend catalogue to predicative and temporal demonstratives
  - Develop formal analysis: what can ‘untranslatables’ tell us about the integration of demonstratives in the syntax of the clause?
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